

REMARKS

The non-final Office Action was issued on pending claims 1-10. Claims 1-10 stand rejected. In this Response, claims 1 and 2 have been amended, claims 11 and 12 have been added, and no claims have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-12 are pending in the application.

Applicants invite the Examiner to call Applicants' Representative to discuss any issues with this application.

Drawings

In Office Action paragraph 1, the drawings were objected to as needing a legend for Fig. 1. Although a legend for Fig. 1 does not appear to be necessary, Applicants enclose a new drawing of Fig. 1 which includes a legend. Thus, Applicants submit that the objection to the drawings has been overcome.

Information Disclosure Statement

In Office Action paragraph 2, the information disclosure statement filed July 6, 2000 was objected to as not including a concise English language explanation of the relevance of the document. Applicants kindly refer the Examiner to pages 1 and 2 of the present specification for an English language discussion of the cited reference. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the information disclosure statement was proper and the cited reference should be considered.

Applicants note that the Form 1449 submitted with the information disclosure statement did not list the date of the reference, which is 1995 as shown in the cited document. Enclosed is a new Form 1449 which includes the date of the cited reference.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In Office Action paragraph 6, claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swartz (US 6,445,694) in view of Pawlowski et al. (US 6,038,199). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claim. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite “a transmission apparatus for sequentially requesting the individual voice messages stored in the voice memory system via an input.” This amendment is supported by the specification at page 4, lines 20-30. Claim 2 has been amended to be consistent with claim 1.

Applicants’ voice processing apparatus invention can request multiple voice messages stored in the voice memory system all together by one simple input. For example, the voice processing apparatus automatically and sequentially requests all of the voice messages and stores the messages separately by a keystroke or a mouse click. A user can thus simply and easily access the voice messages stored in the voice processing apparatus in any arbitrary sequence.

Turning to Swartz (US 6,445,694), Swartz describes a voice mail system whereby the user is informed of the stored voice messages via a HTML page. Subsequently, the user can individually download the stored voice messages (Swartz, column 12, lines 49-54: “By pressing the hypertext link “Review” seen at 333 in FIG. 9, the host services computer sends the HTML page seen in FIG. 10 which displays the voice recognized text of the selected message at 340 and enables the subscriber to control the audio playback of the message using the HTML buttons seen at 342”). According to the voice mail system of Swartz, it is not possible to request multiple stored voice messages by one simple input whereby the voice processing apparatus automatically and sequentially requests the voice messages and stores the messages separately.

Pawlowski et al. (US 6,038,199) merely describes locally storing voice messages on a computer. Pawlowski et al., however, does not provide a teaching as to how a reception of the voice messages occur. Further, Pawlowski et al. does not disclose or suggest requesting and storing multiple voice messages.

Therefore, neither Swartz nor Pawloski et al., combined or individually, disclose or suggest Applicants' invention as claimed in claim 1. For similar reasons, Applicants submit method claim 7 is allowable. Applicants also submit that claims 2-6 and 8-10 are allowable at least for the same reasons claims 1 and 7 are allowable.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the § 103(a) rejections have been overcome.

New Claims

Claims 11 and 12 have been added which further clarify independent claims 1 and 7, respectively. Claims 11 and 12 are fully supported by the Application as originally filed. Applicants submit that claims 11 and 12 are also allowable.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance and request a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Michael S. Leonard
Reg. No. 37,557
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4270

Dated: September 15, 2003